



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/527,309	03/16/2000	Steven B. Wilson	202731	2263

7590 01/28/2005

Rattan Nath
Leydig Voit & Mayer Ltd
Two Prudential Plaza Suite 4900
180 North Stetson
Chicago, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER

CHEN, TE Y

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/527,309

Applicant(s)

WILSON, STEVEN B.

Examin r

Susan Y Chen

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE f this communicati n appears on th cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Peri d f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28 and 33-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28,33,34,36-42 and 44-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 35 and 43 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 08/26/2004, in which claims 1-27 and 29-32 have been canceled, claim 28 has been amended, and claims 33-48 have been newly added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 28, 33-34, 36-42 and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,692,129 issued to Sonderegger et al. (hereinafter referred as Sonderegger) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,625,818 issued to Zarmer et al. (hereinafter referred as Zarmer).

As to claim 28, Sonderegger discloses a system for managing a directory of published objects and removing nonfunctional objects via directory service maintained on a computer network as claimed by applicant [e.g., Abstract, col. 2, Brief Summary of

the Invention section; Fig(s). 1-11 and associated texts], wherein, the system comprising:

a) a pruning module [e.g., the snap-in module, col. 2, lines 61-67] including a module for testing if a specified object, from the directory of published objects, is accessible [e.g., the database object access control interface tool, col. 3, lines 19-23], a module for determining if the specified objects is delete able [e.g., the updating or final cleaning module of the application launcher, col. 3, lines 24-42] and a module for testing if software hosting the specified object is capable of republishing the specified object [e.g., the database object replication interface tool, col. 3, lines 21-23];

b) a domain controller hosting the pruning module and the directory of published objects [e.g. the Application Launcher (50, Fig. 2); col. 3, lines 24-42; Fig(s). 9-10 and associated texts];

c) a thread for executing the pruning module [e, g., col. 19, lines 44-51].

Sonderegger did not expressly disclose a list of orphaned objects is tested in accordance with a specifiable policy.

However, Zarmer disclosed a system for managing a directory of published objects over a computer network [e.g., the unit 10, Fig. 1 and associated texts], he further disclosed a list of orphaned objects is tested in accordance with a specifiable policy [e.g., col. 12, lines 10-15; col. 12, lines 59 – col. 13, lines 2; col. 13, lines 11-20; col. 25, lines 3-9; Fig. 13 and associated texts].

Sonderegger and Zarmer have common subject matters as a system for managing a directory of published objects over a computer network via software interface tool, therefore, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled artisan to modify Sonderegger's interface tool with the technique taught by Zarmer because by doing so, the combined system will provide an interface tool having a list of orphaned objects from the database for the user to search for and test the removable criteria accordingly [e.g., Zarmer: col. 13, lines 11-20; col. 25, lines 3-9; Fig. 13 and associated texts].

As to claim 33, except the features recited in claim 28, the combined system further discloses that the specifiable policy reviews a status of the specified object at least two times prior to making a determination that the specified object is removable [e.g., Zarmer: col. 13, lines 11-20].

As to claim 34, except the features recited in claim 28, the combined system further discloses that the specifiable policy monitors a status of the specified object for a specifiable duration prior to marking a determination that the specified is removable [Zarmer: col. 8, lines 19-22; col. 10, lines 4 – 9, lines 32-39; col. 13, lines 18-20].

As to claim 36, except the features recited in claim 28, the combined system further discloses that the specified object is accessed via a proxy [e.g., Zarmer: the IP servers 27, 25, Fig. 1].

As to claim 37, except the features recited in claim 28, the combined system further discloses that the specified object is a printer object [e.g., Sonderegger's: the unit 118, Fig. 6].

As to claim 38, except the features recited in claim 28, the combined system further discloses that the pruner module having a sleep function to delay the object checking application [e.g., Sonderegger's: col. 19, lines 64 – col. 20, line 4].

As to claim 39, except the features recited in claim 28, the combined system further discloses that the directory of published objects is accessible, tests for valid references [Zarmer: the Firewall checking, col. 4, lines 18-24].

As to claims 40-42 and 44-48, these claims recited the same features as claims 28, 33-34 and 36-39 in form of method, hence are rejected for the same reason.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 35 and 43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 35 and 43 are objected because the prior art on record or that encountered in searching for the invention, fails to disclose or suggest the features of instant invention – a pruning module with a low priority thread to determine if the specified object is orphaned in a combination as claimed by applicant.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Carpenter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,544,316) which discloses a system for optionally registering a local process to allow participation in a single system

Art Unit: 2161

semantic; Campbell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,801) which discloses a system to managing computer and phone network resources.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susan Y Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

January 23, 2005


UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER